REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICTS (Apportionment Plan - 1992)

	House District 6
House District 1	Total Population (1990)
Total Population (1990)	Non-Hispanic Black Population 56,842 Hispanic Population 869
rtienanic ropulation	Geographic Description
Geographic Description	Wayne County (part)
Geographic County (part) Grosse Pointe City	Hamtramck City Highland Park City
Grace Pointe IOWISIID	Detroit City (part)
Grosse Pointe Farms City Grosse Pointe Park City	Tracts: 5071-5079, 5104, 5105, 5301
Crosse Pointe Woods City	
Harner Woods City	
Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5014-5018	House District 7
Tracts: 5014-5010	Total Population (1990)
	Non-Hispanic Black Population 68,/90
House District 2	Thispanic Topulation
1 n - plation (1990) 81,492	Geographic Description
**************************************	Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part)
Non-Hispanic Population	Tracts: 5170-5174, 5176, 5201-5209,
Coographic Description	5213-5215, 5218-5224, 5322-5327,
Wayne County (part)	5330, 5331, 5333, 5312, 5313, 5317-5319
Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5001-5013, 5039-5043, 5121, 5516	3527 35-5
Tracto. 3002 32-5, 33-5	
	House District 8
House District 3	Total Population (1990)
Privat Population (1990)	Non-Hispanic Black Population
Non-Hispanic Black Population /2,916	Hispanic Population
Hispanic Population 4/0	Geographic Description
Geographic Description	Wayne County (part)
Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part)	River Rouge City Detroit City (part)
Tracts: 5019, 5020, 5044, 5045, 5122-5124,	Tracts: 5211, 5212, 5231, 5252, 5254-5256,
5126, 5129, 5132-5136, 5139-5143, 5145, 5146, 5149, 5150, 5153-5157,	5232-5238, 5240-5243, 5245, 5245.99, 5247, 5248, 5257, 5786, 5793
5501, 5502)241,)240,)251, 5100, 5175
No.	House District 9
House District 4	
Total Population (1990)	Total Population (1990) 81,439 Non-Hispanic Black Population 65,369
Non-Hispanic Black Population	Hispanic Population 3,462
Thispanic Topulation	Geographic Description
Geographic Description Wayne County (part)	Wayne County (part)
Detroit City (part)	Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5258, 5260-5263, 5251, 5253, 5264,
Tracts: 5046, 5047, 5107-5109, 5111-5117, 5147, 5148, 5151, 5152, 5161-5164,	5265, 5304, 5305, 5307, 5308, 5310,
5165.99, 5166-5169, 5175, 5177-5181,	5311, 5314-5316, 5332, 5334-5337,
5183-5188, 5102, 5103, 5106, 5165	5341, 5345, 5346
_	VI District 10
House District 5	House District 10
Total Population (1990)	Total Population (1990)
Non-Hispanic Black Population	Hispanic Population
Geographic Description	Geographic Description
Wayne County (part)	Wayne County (part)
Detroit City (part)	Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5080, 5302, 5303, 5361-5364, 5367,
Tracts: 5048, 5052, 5053, 5031-5037, 5049-5051, 5061-5070	5368, 5381-5392
JU 1 7-JUJ1, JUU1-JU70	

House District 11	House District 17
Total Population (1990) 84,357 Non-Hispanic Black Population 67,242 Hispanic Population 1,075	Total Population (1990) 86,251 Non-Hispanic Black Population 22,285 Hispanic Population 1,313
Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5342-5344, 5347, 5350-5352, 5355, 5356, 5357, 5365, 5366, 5370-5372, 5377, 5378, 5454-5458	Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Garden City City Inkster City Wayne City Westland (part) Tracts: 5688-5690
House District 12	
Total Population (1990) 80,522	House District 18
Non-Hispanic Black Population	Total Population (1990)
Geographic Description Wayne County (part)	Non-Hispanic Black Population 1,442 Hispanic Population 1,615
Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5369, 5375, 5376, 5393-5397, 5404, 5405, 5421-5423, 5425, 5429-5431, 5401-5403	Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Canton Township (part) Tracts: 5632, 5640 Westland (part) Tracts: 5671-5687
House District 13	
Total Population (1990)80,119Non-Hispanic Black Population57,645Hispanic Population1,127	House District 19
Hispanic Population 1,127 Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Detroit City (part)	Total Population (1990) 90,576 Non-Hispanic Black Population 258 Hispanic Population 1,219
• Tracts: 5353, 5354, 5373, 5424, 5426-5428, 5439, 5451-5453, 5459-5469, 5440	Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Livonia City (part) Tracts: 5560-5562, 5569-5572, 5579-5592 Redford (part)
House District 14	Tracts: 5541-5546
Total Population (1990)79,577Non-Hispanic Black Population54,247Hispanic Population839	
Geographic Description Wayne County (part)	House District 20
Detroit City (part) Tracts: 5406-5415, 5417, 5418, 5432,	Total Population (1990) 90,017 Non-Hispanic Black Population 1,464 Hispanic Population 1,065
5434-5438, 5441-5443	Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Northville City
House District 15	Northville Township
Total Population (1990) 89,286 Non-Hispanic Black Population 490 Hispanic Population 2,483	Plymouth City Plymouth Township Livonia (part) Tracts: 5563-5568, 5573-5577
Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Dearborn City	11acts: 9900-9906, 9979-9977
	House District 21
House District 16	Total Population (1990)
Total Population (1990) 88,862 Non-Hispanic Black Population 537 Hispanic Population 1970	Hispanic Population
Hispanic Population 1,878 Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Dearborn Heights City	Wayne County (part) Belleville City Sumpter Township Van Buren Township
Redford Township (part) Tracts: 5547-5556	Canton Township (part) Tracts: 5633-5639, 5641-5650

House District 22	1	House District 27	
-	38,338 7,668 2,259	Total Population (1990)	89,993 692 931
Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Romulus City Taylor City (part) Tracts: 5830-5845, 5848		Geographic Description Macomb County (part) East Detroit City Roseville City St. Clair Shores City (part) Tracts: 2503, 2550	
House District 23			
Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	91,354 952 1,796	House District 28 Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population	90,212 902
Geographic Description Wayne County (part) Brownstown Township Flat Rock City Gibraltar City Grosse Ile Township Huron Township Rockwood City		Hispanic Population Geographic Description Macomb County (part) Center Line City Warren City (part) Tracts: 2619, 2621-2642	1,193
Trenton City Woodhaven City Taylor City (part)		House District 29	
Tracts: 5846, 5847, 5915		Total Population (1990)	91,368 286 766
Non-Hispanic Black Population	84,066 600 1,973	Geographic Description Macomb County (part) Sterling Heights (part) Tracts: 2318-2323 Warren City (part) Tracts: 2600-2618, 2620, 2676	
Wayne County (part) Riverview City Southgate City Wyandotte City Allen Park (part) Tracts: 5766, 5767		House District 30 Total Population (1990)	90,120 382 1,030
House District 25		Geographic Description Macomb County (part)	
Total Population (1990)	87,857 5,595 3,776	Sterling Heights (part) Tracts: 2300-2317, 2324, 2256, 2257	
Geographic Description Wayne County (part)			
Ecorse City Lincoln Park City		House District 31 Total Population (1990)	90 /01
Melvindale City Allen Park City (part)		Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	
Tracts: 5729, 5742, 5756, 5760-5765, 5 5786	5785,	Geographic Description Macomb County (part) Fraser City	1,201
House District 26 Total Population (1990)	89,599	Mount Clemens City Clinton Township (part) Tracts: 2400, 2405, 2407-2418, 2450,	2452,
Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	537 988	2453	
Geographic Description Macomb County (part)		House District 32	
Harrison Township Lake Township		Total Population (1990)	88,121
St. Clair Shores City (part) Tracts: 2500-2502, 2504-2522		Non-Hispanic Black Population	460 906

House District 32 (Cont.)

Geographic Description
Macomb County (part)

Armada Township

Bruce Township

Memphis City

Ray Township

Richmond City

Richmond Township

Richmond Township

Shelby Township

Utica City

Washington Township

House District 33

Total Population (1990)88,496Non-Hispanic Black Population1,383Hispanic Population960

Geographic Description

Macomb County (part)

Chesterfield Township

Lenox Township

Macomb Township

New Baltimore City Clinton Township (part)

Tracts: 2401-2404, 2406

House District 34

Total Population (1990)80,071Non-Hispanic Black Population453Hispanic Population980

Geographic Description

Oakland County (part)

Hazel Park City

Madison Heights City

Royal Oak City (part)

Tracts: 1839-1847

House District 35

Total Population (1990) 86,711

Non-Hispanic Black Population 14,070

Hispanic Population 1,200

Geographic Description

Oakland County (part)

Berkley City

Ferndale City

Huntington Woods City

Oak Park City

Pleasant Ridge City

Royal Oak Township

House District 36

Total Population (1990)80,057Non-Hispanic Black Population22,857Hispanic Population1,351

Geographic Description

Oakland County (part) Lathrup Village City Southfield City

House District 37

 Total Population (1990)
 84,784

 Non-Hispanic Black Population
 1,499

 Hispanic Population
 965

Geographic Description

Oakland County (part)

Farmington City

Farmington Hills City

House District 38

 Total Population (1990)
 78,771

 Non-Hispanic Black Population
 315

 Hispanic Population
 782

Geographic Description

Oakland County (part)

Lyon Township

Milford Township Northville City

Novi City

Novi Township

South Lyon City

Walled Lake City Wixom City

House District 39

Total Population (1990)86,689Non-Hispanic Black Population1,158Hispanic Population1,027

Geographic Description

Oakland County (part)

Commerce Township Orchard Lake Village City

West Bloomfield Township

Keego Harbor City

House District 40

Total Population (1990)82,897Non-Hispanic Black Population1,345Hispanic Population925

Geographic Description

Oakland County (part)

Birmingham City

Bloomfield Township

Bloomfield Hills City

Southfield Township Sylvan Lake City

Oylvair Lanc Oity

House District 41

Total Population (1990)82,241Non-Hispanic Black Population740Hispanic Population919

Geographic Description

Oakland County (part)

Clawson City

Royal Oak City (part)

Tracts: 1830-1838 Troy City (part)

Tracts: 1966-1969, 1973-1977

	House District 47	
78,463 922 1,071	Non-Hispanic Black Population	7,579 951 1,175
1940,	Geographic Description Genesee County (part) Atlas Township Clio City Davison City Davison Township Flushing City Flushing Township Forest Township Montrose City	
88,570 31,337 6,201	Montrose Township Richfield Township Thetford Township Vienna Township	
	House District 48	٠
	Non-Hispanic Black Population 5	3,304 7,718 1,800
	Geographic Description Genesee County (part)	
89,300 846 1,832	Tracts: 1-14, 17, 103.04, 105.01, 108.02 Mount Morris Township	
	House District 49	
	Total Population (1990)	
	Geographic Description Genesee County (part)	
81,914 724 1,131	Tracts: 15, 16, 18-41, 108.03, 109.04, 11	0,
	House District 50 Total Population (1990)	8,154
	Non-Hispanic Black Population	4,166 1,641
2, 1934	Genesee County (part) Burton City Genesee Township Grand Blanc City	
	Mount Morris City	
83,124 535 1,246		
1.	Total Population (1990)	8,767 2,918 1,228
	922 1,071 1940, 88,570 31,337 6,201 89,300 846 1,832 81,914 724 1,131	Total Population (1990) 87

House District 51 (Cont.)

Fenton Township Flint Township Gaines Township

Linden City

Mundy Township

Swartz Creek City

House District 52

Total Population (1990)	82,601
Non-Hispanic Black Population	4,939
Hispanic Population	1,439

Geographic Description

Washtenaw County (part)

Northfield Township Scio Township Webster Township

Dexter Township

Lima Township Lyndon Township

Sylvan Township Ann Arbor (part)

Tracts: 4021-4028, 4031-4035, 4042, 4053, 4060, 4520

Ann Arbor Township (part)*

Tracts: 4022-4028, 4031, 4032, 4034, 4035, 4041, 4042, 4043 (part) Block 103B, 4053, 4060, 4070, 4510

House District 53

Total Population (1990)	84,543
Non-Hispanic Black Population	8,508
Hispanic Population	2,168

Geographic Description Washtenaw County (part)

Ann Arbor (part)

Tracts: 6, 4001-4008, 4041, 4043-4046, 4051, 4052, 4054, 4055, 4142, 4146, 4148

Ann Arbor Township (part)**

Tracts: 4043 (part) Block 210B, 4045, 4046 Pittsfield Township

House District 54

Total Population (1990)	82,607
Non-Hispanic Black Population	16,848
Hispanic Population	1,345

Geographic Description

Washtenaw County (part)

Salem Township Superior Township

Ypsilanti City Ypsilanti Township

House District 55

Total Population (1990)	85,802
Non-Hispanic Black Population	2,065
Hispanic Population	1 421

Geographic Description

Monroe County (part) Bedford Township Dundee Township

House District 55 (Cont.)

Exeter Township Ida Township London Township Milan City Milan Township Petersburg City Summerfield Township Whiteford Township

Washtenaw County (part) Augusta Township

> Bridgewater Township Freedom Township

Lodi Township Manchester Township

Milan City

Saline City Saline Township

Sharon Township

York Township

Lenawee County (part)

Macon Township

House District 56

Total Population (1990)	82,405
Non-Hispanic Black Population	1,371
Hispanic Population	1,452

Geographic Description

Monroe County (part) Ash Township Berlin Township Erie Township Frenchtown Township La Salle Township Luna Pier City Monroe City Monroe Township

Raisinville Township

House District 57

Total Population (1990)	90,055
Non-Hispanic Black Population	1,278
Hispanic Population	5,498

Geographic Description

Lenawee County (part)

Adrian City

Adrian Township Blissfield Township

Cambridge Township

Clinton Township Deerfield Township

Dover Township

Fairfield Township

Franklin Township

Hudson City Hudson Township

Madison Charter Township

Medina Township Morenci City

Ogden Township

Palmyra Township

Raisin Township Ridgeway Township

Riga Township Rollin Township

See District 53.

^{**} Three islands of Ann Arbor Township (one containing a population of 7) completely surrounded by Ann Arbor City and not a move or split. 413 Mich 96, 201.

House District 57 (Cont.)		House District 62	
Rome Township Seneca Township Tecumseh City		Total Population (1990)	88,082 10,856 1,437
Tecumseh Township Woodstock Township		Geographic Description Calhoun County (part) Battle Creek City Bedford Township	•
House District 58		Emmet Township	
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	84,933 799 863	Pennfield Township Springfield City	
Geographic Description Branch County Hillsdale County		House District 63	
		Total Population (1990)	89,129 3,835
House District 59	00 /7/	Hispanic Population Geographic Description	1,528
Total Population (1990)	89,474 3,205 816	Kalamazoo County (part) Brady Township Charleston Township	
Geographic Description		Climax Township	
St. Joseph County Cass County (part)		Comstock Township Galesburg City	
Calvin Township Howard Township		Pavilion Township	
Jefferson Township	٠.	Prairie Ronde Township Ross Township	
Marcellus Township Mason Township		Schoolcraft Township	
Milton Township		Wakeshma Township Calhoun County (part)	
Newberg Township Niles City		Albion City	
Ontwa Township		Albion Township Athens Township	
Penn Township Porter Township		Burlington Township Clarence Township	
		Clarendon Township	
House District 60		Convis Township Eckford Township	
Total Population (1990)	91,057 16,006 2,455	Fredonia Township Homer Township Lee Township	
Geographic Description		Leroy Township Marengo Township	
Kalamazoo County (part) Kalamazoo City		Marshall City	
Kalamazoo Township (part) Tracts: 1, 14.01, 14.02, 18.03		Marshall Township Newton Township	
Parchment City		Sheridan Township	
Portage City (part)* Tract: 18.02	İ	Tekonsha Township	
House District 61		House District 64	
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	91,125 3,229 1,113	Total Population (1990)	79,068 11,327 1,599
Geographic Description	, ,	Geographic Description Jackson County (part)	
Kalamazoo County (part) Kalamazoo Township (part)		Blackman Township	
Tracts: 2.02, 15.01-15.03		Jackson City Summit Township	
Alamo Township Cooper Township		comme to mone	
Oshtemo Township			
Portage City (part)** Tracts: 19.02, 19.04-19.07, 20.01, 20.0	02.	House District 65	
21.01, 21.02	·	Total Population (1990)	77,734 503
Richland Township Texas Township		Hispanic Population	503 852
• A single island with no population completely sur. • See District 60.	rounded by Kala	amazoo City and not a move or split.	

³¹³

House District 65 (Cont.)

Geographic Description

Jackson County (part) Columbia Township

Concord Township

Grass Lake Township

Hanover Township Henrietta Township

Leoni Township

Liberty Township

Napoleon Township Norvell Township

Parma Township Pulaski Township

Rives Township

Sandstone Township Spring Arbor Township

Springport Township Tompkins Township

Waterloo Township

Eaton County (part) Eaton Rapids City

Hamlin Township

House District 66

80,795 Non-Hispanic Black Population 625 652 Hispanic Population

Geographic Description

Livingston County (part)

Brighton City

Brighton Township

Genoa Township

Green Oak Township Hamburg Township

Hartland Township

Howell City

Marion Township

Oceola Township

House District 67

Total Population (1990)	80,697
Non-Hispanic Black Population	, 538
Hispanic Population	

Geographic Description

Livingston County (part)

Cohoctah Township

Conway Township

Deerfield Township

Handy Township

Howell Township

Iosco Township

Putnam Township

Tyrone Township

Unadilla Township

Ingham County (part)

Bunker Hill Township

Ingham Township Leroy Township

Leslie City Leslie Township

Locke Township

Mason City

Onondaga Township

Stockbridge Township Vevay Township

Wheatfield Township

House District 67 (Cont.)

White Oak Township

Williamston City

Williamstown Township Meridian Township (part)

Tract: 48

House District 68

78,656 10,199 Non-Hispanic Black Population

Hispanic Population 3.699

Geographic Description

Ingham County (part)

Lansing Township (part) Tracts: 17.01, 17.02, 34, 35

Alaiedon Township

Aurelius Township

Delhi Charter Township

Lansing City (part)

Tracts: 15, 17.01, 17.02, 19, 24-27, 34, 35, 36.01, 36.02, 37, 51, 52.01, 52.02,

53.03, 55.01

House District 69

78,012

Non-Hispanic Black Population 11,990 Hispanic Population

Geographic Description

Ingham County (part)

Lansing Township (part) Tracts: 9, 10, 12, 31.01, 31.02, 32, 38.01,

Lansing City (part)

Tracts: 1-10, 12-14, 16, 20-23, 28, 29.01, 29.02, 31.01, 31.02, 32, 33.01, 33.02,

38.01 40, 44.01, 53.02, 53.04, 65

House District 70

79,397 Non-Hispanic Black Population 4,631 1,871 Hispanic Population

Geographic Description

Ingham County (part)

East Lansing City

Meridian Township (part)

Tracts: 39.01, 39.02, 43.01, 43.02, 44.01,

45-47, 49.01, 49.02, 50.01, 50.02

House District 71

85,833 3,263 Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population

Geographic Description

Eaton County (part)

Bellevue Township

Benton Township

Brookfield Township

Carmel Township Charlotte City

Chester Township

Delta Township

Eaton Township

21/4 CHAPTER III • THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

House District 71 (Cont.)	1	House District 75	
Eaton Rapids Township Grand Ledge City Kalamo Township Lansing City		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population Geographic Description	
Olivet City Oneida Charter Township Potterville City Roxand Township Sunfield Township Vermontville Township Walton Township		Kent County (part) Grand Rapids City (part) Tracts: 3, 4, 10, 23, 24, 31, 32, 34, 35, 42-46, 118.01, 126.01, 11.02, 33, 118.02, 123, 142, 126.02	
Windsor Township		House District 76	
House District 72		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	84,032 9,536 4,212
Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	84,717 2,482 1,198	Geographic Description Kent County (part) Grand Rapids City (part) Tracts: 1, 2, 5-9, 12-22, 25-30, 116	
Geographic Description Kent County (part)			
Byron Township Caledonia Township Cascade Township		House District 77 Total Population (1990)	85,782
Gaines Township Kentwood City		Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	8,290 5,650
vv District 72		Geographic Description Kent County (part) Grand Rapids City (part)	
House District 73 Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population	84,421 535	Tracts: 36-41 Wyoming City	
Hispanic Population	829	House District 78	
Kent County (part) Ada Township Algoma Township		Total Population (1990) Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	80,393 4,421 1,638
Bowne Township Cannon Township East Grand Rapids City Grand Rapids Charter Township		Geographic Description Berrien County (part) Baroda Township Berrien Township	
Lowell City Lowell Township Plainfield Township		Bertrand Township Bridgman City Buchanan City	
Rockford City Vergennes Township		Buchanan Township Chikaming Township Galien Township	
House District 74		Lake Charter Township New Buffalo City New Buffalo Township	
Total Population (1990)		Niles City Niles Township	
Non-Hispanic Black Population Hispanic Population	450 1,079	Oronoko Township Pipestone Township	
Geographic Description Kent County (part)		Royalton Township Sodus Township	
Alpine Township Cedar Springs City Courtland Township Grandville City		Three Oaks Township Weesaw Township	
Grattan Township		House District 79	
Nelson Township Oakfield Township Solon Township Sparta Township		Total Population (1990)	80,985 20,267 1,045
Spencer Township Tyrone Township		Geographic Description Berrien County (part) Bainbridge Township	
Walker City Ottawa County (part) Tallmadge Township		Benton Charter Township Benton Harbor City	

House District 79 (Cont.)

Coloma City Coloma Township Hagar Township Lincoln Township

St. Joseph City

St. Joseph Charter Township Watervliet City

Watervliet Township

House District 80

Total Population (1990)	88,976
Non-Hispanic Black Population	6,714
Hispanic Population	2,635

Geographic Description

Van Buren County Cass County (part)

Dowagiac City

La Grange Township Pokagon Township Silver Creek Township

Volinia Township Wayne Township

House District 81

Total Population (1990)	90,246
Non-Hispanic Black Population	2,763
Hispanic Population	1,861

Geographic Description

St. Clair County (part) Burtchville Township China Township Clyde Township East China Township Fort Gratiot Township Kimball Township Marysville City Port Huron City

Port Huron Township St. Clair City St. Clair Township

House District 82

Total Population (1990)	
Non-Hispanic Black Population	591
Hispanic Population	1 517

Geographic Description

Lapeer County (part) Almont Township Attica Township Dryden Township Imlay Township Imlay City City Lapeer City

Lapeer Township Metamora Township St. Clair County (part)

Algonac City Berlin Township Brockway Township Casco Township Clay Township

Columbus Township Cottrellville Township Emmett Township

* See District 87.

House District 82 (Cont.)

Grant Township Greenwood Township Ira Township Kenockee Township Lynn Township Marine City City Memphis City Mussey Township Riley Township Wales Township Yale City

House District 83

Total Population (1990)	81,878
Non-Hispanic Black Population	99
Hispanic Population	1,524

Geographic Description Lapeer County (part) Arcadia Township Brown City City Burlington Township Burnside Township Deerfield Township Elba Township Goodland Township Hadley Township Marathon Township Mayfield Township North Branch Township Oregon Township Rich Township

House District 84

Total Population (1990)	90,449
Non-Hispanic Black Population	489
Hispanic Population	1,522

Geographic Description

Huron County Tuscola County

Sanilac County

House District 85

Total Population (1990)	77,894
Non-Hispanic Black Population	100
Hispanic Population	1,222

Geographic Description

Shiawassee County Clinton County (part)

Duplain Township Ovid Township Victor Township

House District 86

Total Population (1990)	78,569
Non-Hispanic Black Population	299
Hispanic Population	1,621

Geographic Description

Ionia County (part) Danby Township

> Ionia City* (all except Tract 306 [part] Block 104A)

House District 86 (Cont.)

Ionia Township Lyons Township

North Plains Township

Orange Township

Orleans Township

Portland City

Portland Township

Ronald Township

Sebewa Township

Clinton County (part)

Bath Township

Bengal Township

Bingham Township

Dallas Township

DeWitt City

DeWitt Township

Eagle Township

Essex Township

Greenbush Township Lebanon Township

Olive Township

Riley Township St. Johns City

Watertown Township

Westphalia Township

House District 87

Total Population (1990)	78,271
Non-Hispanic Black Population	2,965
Hispanic Population	1 103

Geographic Description

Barry County

Ionia County (part)

Belding City

Berlin Township

Boston Township

Campbell Township

Easton Township

Keene Township

Odessa Township Otisco Township

Ionia City (part)*

Tract: 306 (part)

Block: 104A

House District 88

Total Population (1990)	90,509
Non-Hispanic Black Population	1,419
Hispanic Population	2,895

Geographic Description

Allegan County

House District 89

Total Population (1990)	90,747
Non-Hispanic Black Population	458
Hispanic Population	1.010

Geographic Description

Ottawa County (part) Chester Township

Crockery Township

Polkton Township Spring Lake Township

House District 89 (Cont.)

Allendale Township

Coopersville City

Ferrysburg City

Georgetown Township

Grand Haven City

Grand Haven Township

Wright Township

House District 90

Total Population (1990)	90,728
Non-Hispanic Black Population	465
Hispanic Population	6,887

Geographic Description

Ottawa County (part) Blendon Township

Holland City

Holland Township Hudsonville City

Jamestown Township

Olive Township

Park Township

Port Sheldon Township

Robinson Township

Zeeland City

Zeeland Township

House District 91

Total Population (1990)	79,765
Non-Hispanic Black Population	923
Hispanic Population	1,406

Geographic Description Muskegon County (part)

Blue Lake Township

Casnovia Township

Cedar Creek Township

Dalton Township

Egelston Township

Fruitland Township

Fruitport Township

Holton Township

Montague City

Montague Township

Moorland Township

Norton Shores City

Ravenna Township

Roosevelt Park City

Sullivan Township

Whitehall City

Whitehall Township

White River Township

House District 92

Total Population (1990)	79,218
Non-Hispanic Black Population	20,521
Hispanic Population	2,217

Geographic Description

Muskegon County (part)

Laketon Township Muskegon City

Muskegon Township

Muskegon Heights City North Muskegon City

^{*} This single census block is an island completely surrounded by Easton Township. It contains no population and is not a move or a split.

House District 93	House District 96 (Cont.)
Total Population (1990)	
Non-Hispanic Black Population 1,26	Saginaw County (part)
Hispanic Population	Blumfield Township
Geographic Description	Carrollton Township
Montcalm County	Kochville Township
Gratiot (part)	Saginaw Township
Alma City	Zilwaukee City
Aracada Township	Zilwaukee Township
Bethany Township	Bay County (part)
Elba Township	Essexville City
Emerson Township	Frankenlust Township
Fulton Township Hamilton Township	Hampton Township
Ithaca City	Merritt Township
Lafayette Township	Monitor Township
Newark Township	Portsmouth Township
New Haven Township	
North Shade Township	
North Star Township	House District 97
Pine River Township	
St. Louis City	Total Population (1990)
Seville Township	Non-Hispanic Black Population
Sumner Township	Hispanic Population
Washington Township	Geographic Description
•	Bay County (part)
rr	Auburn City
House District 94	Bangor Township
Total Population (1990)	8 Bay City City
Non-Hispanic Black Population 2,00	3 Beaver Township
Hispanic Population	9 Fraser Township
Geographic Description	Garfield Township
aginaw County (part)	Gibson Township
Albee Township	Kawkawlin Township
Birch Run Township	Midland City
Brant Township	Mount Forest Township
Bridgeport Township	Pinconning City
Chapin Township	Phiconning Township
Frankenmuth City	Williams Township
Frankenmuth Township	
Fremont Township	- I
James Township	House District 98
Jonesfield Township	Total Population (1990)
Lakefield Township	Non-Hispanic Black Population
Marion Township	Hispanic Population
Richland Township	
St. Charles Township	Geographic Description
Spaulding Township	Midland County
Swan Creek Township	Gratiot County (part)
Taymouth Township	Wheeler Township
Thomas Township Tittabawassee Township	
Brady Township	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Chesaning Township	House District 99
Maple Grove Township	Total Population (1990)
	Non-Hispanic Black Population
	Hispanic Population
Iouse District 95	
otal Population (1990) 80,41	Geographic Description
Von-Hispanic Black Population	, J
Rispanic Population	Isabella County
	. 1 + 17 68
Geographic Description	The same of the sa
aginaw County (part)	110use District 100
Buena Vista Charter Township	Total Population (1990)
Saginaw City	Non-Hispanic Black Population 2,
	Hispanic Population
Iouse District 96	· · ·
•	Geographic Description
otal Population (1990) 81,70	
Ion-Hispanic Black Population 1,70	7 Mecosta County

House Distri	ct 101
--------------	--------

Total Population (1990)	81,450
Non-Hispanic Black Population	294
Hispanic Population	2,241
1 1	

Geographic Description

Benzie County Manistee County Mason County Oceana County

House District 102

Total Population (1990)	78,429
Non-Hispanic Black Population	127
Hispanic Population	457

Geographic Description

Missaukee County Osceola County Roscommon County Wexford County

House District 103

Total Population (1990)	85,717
Non-Hispanic Black Population	667
Hispanic Population	764

Geographic Description

Arenac County Gladwin County Iosco County Ogemaw County

House District 104

Total Population (1990)	80,800
Non-Hispanic Black Population	267
Hispanic Population	691
Geographic Description	

Grand Traverse County Leelanau County

House District 105

Total Population (1990)	88,822
Non-Hispanic Black Population	337
Hispanic Population	494

Geographic Description

Alcona County Antrim County Crawford County Kalkaska County Montmorency County Oscoda County Otsego County

House District 106

374
78
37,214

Alpena County Charlevoix County Cheboygan County Presque Isle County

House District 107

Total Population (1990)	84,383
Non-Hispanic Black Population	2,302
Hispanic Population	488

Geographic Description

Emmet County Luce County Mackinac County Schoolcraft County Chippewa County

House District 108

Total Population (1990)	89,531
Non-Hispanic Black Population	45
Hispanic Population	311
Geographic Description	

Delta County

Dickinson County Menominee County

House District 109

· · · · · · · ·	
Total Population (1990)	79,859
Non-Hispanic Black Population	1,360
Hispanic Population	609

Geographic Description

Alger County Marquette County

House District 110

Total Population (1990)	85,182
Non-Hispanic Black Population	453
Hispanic Population	373

Geographic Description

Baraga County Gogebic County Houghton County Iron County Keweenaw County Ontonagon County

Note: Following the 1990 federal decennial census, the Michigan Legislature attempted to enact a plan reapportioning itself, but these efforts failed. In 1991, a lawsuit was filed in losco Circuit Court (Neff v Secretary of State) requesting the circuit judge to declare the 1982 apportionment and districting plan invalid due to changes in population, to enjoin elections under the 1982 plan, and to undertake a new and proper apportionment of the legislature. Thereafter, Governor John M. Engler asked the Michigan Supreme Court to authorize the circuit judge to certify questions that would aid in apportioning the legislature elegislature. At about the same time, an original action was filed in the Michigan Supreme Court invoking its jurisdiction under Const 1963, at 4. In view of the pendency of the new matter, the supreme court dismissed the losco Circuit Court case. In re Apportionment of the State Legislature – 1992, 439 Mich 1203 (1991).

On December 9, 1991, the Michigan Supreme Court entered an order appointing three special masters and directed them to December 9, 1991, the Michigan Supreme Court if the legislature and the governor did not enact one by January 15, 1992. (Although bills to reapportion the legislature were introduced, no plan was enacted into law before the deadline.) The Panel of Special Masters began evaluating plans that had been submitted by several sources, including the major political parties, according to criteria outlined in the court's 1982 reapportionment decision and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended. After conducting several days of hearings in late January, the panel determined that none of the plans submitted to them was satisfactory and proceeded to draw their own plan. On February 20, 1992, the special masters submitted their reapportionment plan for the state legislature to the supreme court accompanied by the following report:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL MASTERS ON LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

By order of December 9, 1991, the Supreme Court appointed Judges Hood, Lesinski and Peterson (subsequently replaced by Judge Porter) as the Panel of Special Masters to submit a plan for the reapportionment of the Michigan Legislature in the event that the legislature did not enact such a plan by January 15, 1992. The order directed the panel as follows:

"4. Except as otherwise required by constitution or by law, the criteria to be employed in adopting a plan are those set forth in *In re Apportionment of State Legislature*—1982, 413 Mich 96, at pp 141-142. However, we intimate no opinion with respect to the range of allowable population divergence (see *Maban* v *Howell*, 410 US 315 [1973] and *Brown* v *Thompson*, 462 US 835 [1983]), or with respect to the application of the Voting Rights Act (see *Thornburg* v *Gingles*, 478 US

Pursuant to said order the panel met and established a schedule of events to culminate in the submission of a plan to the Court by February 15, 1992.

Pursuant to that schedule, the panel held evidentiary hearings on January 27, 28 and 29, 1992, and considered prehearing and posthearing briefs submitted by the parties and by intervening parties amicus curiae. The panel heard testimony regarding the creation of the Neff and Hoffman plans and testimony of experts and other witnesses presented at the hearings. It allowed opening creation of the release and reliable plants and testimionly of experts and other witnesses presented at the nearings. It another operations to witnesses on behalf of intervenor seatenests by intervenors Kelly and Powers, as well as the submission of certain questions to witnesses on behalf of intervenor Senator Kelly. In evaluating the plans submitted, the panel was guided by the 1982 Supreme Court reapportionment decision and criteria found therein. The panel also considered the implications of the Voting Rights Act, as amended in 1982 (VRA).

The panel's review of the plans and the matter submitted to it has led it to the conclusion that none of the plans submitted is

acceptable because they either fail to comply with the 1982 criteria or do so only facially. Viewed under the totality of the circumstances, the panel found a disregard of some specific criteria, such as community of interest or compactness. A review of the primary party's plans, for example, reveal several instances of districts whose configuration would challenge both the candidates and the voters to understand where their district lies.

and the voters to understand where their district lies.

In view of the findings of the panel that no one plan met the court's criteria, the panel followed paragraph 5 of the December 9, 1991, order, and submits to the Court a reapportionment plan which it has drafted. The panel did not consider political partisanship in any way and its plan is "incumbent neutral," in that no attempt whatsoever was made to determine what effect the redrawn districts might have on existing officeholders. The panel concluded that these concepts, as well as "political fairness," which might quite properly be considered in legislatively-drafted plans should not be considered by nonpartisan masters.

All the parties, on the whole, agreed that the plan was to be developed employing the criteria set forth in In re Apportionment of State Legislature—1982, 413 Mich 96 (1982) (hereafter "1982") and the requirements under the federal constitution regarding allowable population divergences between districts and commitment to not diluting the ability of minority groups to participate in the electrical process, as quaranteed by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. It was the actual application of these principles

anowane population divergences between districts and comminent to flot until give anony or infinitive groups to participate in the electoral process, as guaranteed by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. It was the actual application of these principles to a specific plan which the parties could not agree upon.

There is also no dispute regarding the number of house and senate seats to be assigned, the population totals to be employed, or the use of 16.4% as the allowable population divergence (the percentage used in the 1982 apportionment.)

The one thing that became clear as this panel reviewed the submittals and set about its own task, was that there should be no application of the percentage of th

The orie uning that became clear as this parter reviewed the subtributes and set about its own task, was that there stolded be no absolute hierarchy of criteria. While counties may be the building blocks of our apportionment system (1982, 413 Mich at 125), county lines were "broken" when necessary to achieve acceptable population divergence; flexibility in population divergence was employed to maintain minority electorial participation already realized; VRA interests were recognized and followed, but not to the exclusion of concerns of integrity of existing boundary lines, communities of interest, compactness and contiguity.

I. The 1982 Criteria

Pursuant to correspondence from this panel to the Michigan Supreme Court in January, 1992, the panel employed the criteria set forth in 1982 at pages 141-142 and 154-156. Review of the 154-156 criteria indicates that it both restates the criteria in the set forth in 1982 at pages 141-142 and 194-190. Review of the 194-190 enteria indicates that it both restates the criteria in the Supreme Court's original opinion and order in 1982, and set forth guidance for the types of practical problems which occur, as this panel became well aware, in applying those criteria. In general, employment of the criteria meant that this panel strove to maintain existing county, city and township lines; that there was a commitment to compact and contiguous districts, that where lines had to be broken that it was done so as to disturb as little as possible the existing communy of interest; and that the panel employ the minimal number of breaks feasible to attain all the goals involved in this process, such as equal population distribution and VRA

Cases reviewing equal population and VRA claims recognize the legitimacy of these same state criteria of compactness, integrity of existing political subdivisions and contiguity. See Martin v Mabus, 700 F Supp 327, 334-35 (SD Miss 1988). Employment of these criteria can act as a means of avoiding gerrymandering, Reynolds v Sims, 377 US 533, 581; 12 L Ed 2d 506; 84 S Ct 1367 (1963), as well as a means of assuring effective representation within an existing community of interest. Reynolds at 580-581; Dillard v Baldutin County, 686 F Supp 1459 (MD Ala 1988). An unusually shaped district can signal a problem with how the district is drawn. Rarcher v Daggett, 462 US 725, 755; 102 S Ct 2653, 2672 (1983). While this panel did not mechanically apply any criteria, it did strive to employ the 1982 criteria in a consistent and thoughtful manner.

Because this nagel was creating its own plan it did not consider whether its plan had the smallest number of breaks as

Because this panel was creating its own plan, it did not consider whether its plan had the smallest number of breaks as compared to any other plan. Even if that had been a concern, obviously a rule that the smallest number of breaks indicates the

most acceptable plan could not be absolutely or mechanically applied; it could only be employed where the plans were equal in achieving the overall goals of reapportionment.

The panel does note that the plan which it has drafted breaks fewer county lines than any plan submitted by the primary parties except the Neff "overlay" plan, which admittedly has one fewer county line break than the panel's plan. We reject that plan, however, because we feel that the configuration of its districts is unreasonable and does undue violence to the corollary concepts of compactness and community interest.

II. Equal Population

The rule regarding acceptable population divergence between districts is basically the same since 1982. Brown v Thompson 462 US 835; 77 L Ed 2d 214; 103 S Ct 2690 (1983), made it clear that a divergence of greater than 10% puts a burden on the state to justify the deviation, but that a divergence in the range of 16% could be acceptable where the situation of the state required. The practicalities of drawing districts in Michigan, with both populous urban areas and larger rural areas, as well as VRA concerns, made continued recognition of a 16.4% divergence acceptable to this panel. While, as required by the federal constitution, our goal was a good faith effort to create districts as nearly equal in population as practicable (*Reynolds, supra*, at 577), the 16.4% divergence allowed this panel some leeway in dealing with the practicalities of reapportionment.

III. VRA

First, it should be recognized that there is no VRA claim before this panel. There are two districts which come under the VRA section 5 preclearance requirement, but it was this panel's understanding that those districts, in practical matters, required no

Special consideration of this panel.

Second, what is really before this panel are concerns for complying with the Fifteenth Amendment of the federal constitution.

Second, what is really before this panel are concerns for complying with the Fifteenth Amendment of the federal constitution. The VRA is a federal statutory tool for enforcing the Fifteenth Amendment, Chisom v Roehmer, 111 S Ct 2354, 2357 (1991). The cases applying the Act were useful for elucidating instances and remedies which can be of concern in preserving or assuring

minority voting rights.

While cases and commentary concerning the VRA were instructive, they proved of limited practical value to this panel. The numerous lawsuits which have been brought under the VRA are typically brought by members of a protected group, involve extensive fact-finding at the trial level, and concern issues — such as the viability of multi-member districts — which are not before extensive fact-intaining at the that level, and concern issues — such as the viability of multi-member districts — which are not before this panel. Furthermore, there are present uncertainties concerning the scope and intent of the Act which are best resolved by the courts. (For example, compare Armour v State of Obio, 775 F Supp 1044 (ND Ohio 1991) and Hastert v State Bd of Elections, 777 F Supp 634, 651-655 (ND Ill, 1991), on the creation of "influence districts.") While each party stated that its plan complied with the VRA, there was no agreement on what were the practical criteria to be applied. In general, the cases provide few specific directives which apply to our present nonadversarial situation where those assigned the task of reapportionment seek to assure before-the-fact that members of a minority group can both participate in the political process and elect legislators of their choice.

The recently released opinion of the California Supreme Court, adopting a reapportionment plan prepared at its direction by a panel of special masters, provided some reassurance regarding this panel's understanding and approach to the VRA. For all

practical purposes in Wilson, the VRA criteria condensed to identification and preservation of functionally, geographically compact practical purposes in wisson, the VNA criteria concensed to identification and preservation of functionally, geographically compact minority groups of sufficient voting strength to constitute a majority in a single-member district and the avoidance of unnecessary fragmentation and undue concentration or packing. Wilson v March Fong Eu (No. S022835, filed Jan 27, 1992, slip op pp 7-8.) The masters declined to speculate as to evidence regarding voting patterns or socioeconomic data, or to identify and resolve open legal questions concerning the interpretation or application of the VRA. They applied 1990 federal census data and a "functional" view "A "practical" evaluation of the "past and present reality" as their primary took in densiting district. Marter Beach According V. V. and "practical" evaluation of the "past and present reality" as their primary tools in drawing districts. Masters Report, Appendix I, to

quesuons conscribing the interpretation of application of the YRA. Iney applied 1990 federal census data and a "functional" view and "practical" evaluation of the "past and present reality" as their primary tools in drawing districts. Masters Report, Appendix I, to Wilson, pp 9, 14-18.

Similarly, this panel relied on the 1990 census figures rather than any of the approaches advocated by the parties' experts for determining minority voting strength in a district. We recognized the recurring directive from Section 2 of the VRA: that consideration of whether there has been a denial or abridgement of voting rights depends on the totality of the circumstances. See 42 USC 1973(b) and Thornburg v Gingles, 478 US 42, 43-46; 106 S Ct 2752, 2762-2764, 92 I. Ed 2d 25 (1986). For this panel, that included the existing reality of minority-majority districts in Wayne County and existing representation of minority groups by minority group representatives. The simple identification of areas with 60-65% minority population did not mean that the panel's task was done. Rather, we also considered a practical evaluation of the past and present reality of the districts in question. Thornburg, 478 US at 45; White v Regester, 412 US 755, 769-770 (1972); Garza v County of Los Angeles, 918 F2d 763, 770 (CA 9, 1990).

This panel recognized concerns regarding the "fracturing" and "packing" of minority populations, Ketchuru v Byrne, 740 F 2d 1398, 1408 notes 7 and 8 (CA 7, 1984), and the avoidance of "retrogression." Id, at 1402, note 2. It was concern with fracturing that resulted in the preservation of the Hispanic population concentration in Southwest Detroit, rather than the division called for in the Neff plan. However, not all members of a minority group must reside in a minority-majority district. See Campos v City of Baytoun, 840 F 2d 1240, 1244 (CA 5, 1988). As to packing, where residency patterns — rather than the manipulation of district lines — result in a district with a minority population of greater than 80%, that does not

The panel concludes that it has adopted a plan in compliance with the court's directives, and submits the same herewith. County, township and city line breaks are set forth in detail in Exhibits A. & B.

On April 1, 1992, the Supreme Court entered an order approving, with modifications, the apportionment plan presented by the masters. The court noted that "fulhe apportionment plan of the masters has been drawn in accordance with the criteria stated in In re Apportionment of State Legislature — 1982, 413 Mich 96, 141-142, 154-156, 321 NW2d 565 (1982), reb den 413 Mich 149, 321 NW2d 585 (1982), app dis'd sub nom Kleiner v Sanderson, 459 US 900, 103 S Ct. 201; 74 L Ed 2d 161 (1982). The masters also examined §2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended in 1982 (VRA), 42 USC 1973. After the parties stipulated that, as in 1982, (accordance points was the maximum allowable considerance in the state of the voting Rights and the state of the voting Rights are the state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated to the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and the voting Rights are stated as a state of the voting Rights and t 16.4 percentage points was the maximum allowable population divergence, the masters ruled that they would consider no plan

with greater divergence than 16.4 percentage points.

Some who commented on the report of the masters expressed concerns regarding the population divergence found in the masters' plan. In 1982, we directed that the divergence between the largest and smallest districts could not exceed 16.4 percentage points. Maban v Howell, 410 US 315; 93 S Ct 979; 35 L Ed 2d 320 (1973).

points. Mapan's Trower, 410 us 313; 93 S U(3/9); 33 Le 243 320 (13/3).

The plan developed by the masters approaches, but does not exceed, that limit. We remain persuaded that a population divergence of 16.4 percentage points is constitutional in light of the "substantial and legitimate state concerns" which underlie this apportionment. Brown v Thomson, 462 US 835; 103 S Ct 2690; 77 L Ed 2d 214 (1983). These valid state concerns focus on the importance of honoring jurisdictional lines, in order to foster effective representative government. We are persuaded that the objectives of preserving county and municipal boundaries, and of minimizing shifts of municipalities and voters, justify the

population divergence that is present in the masters' plan.

Others have suggested that the masters' plan would violate the VRA, particularly with regard to the apportionment of Wayne County. This statute is violated if "the political processes leading to nomination or election in the State or political subdivision are not equally open to participation by members of a class of citizens protected by [the VRA] in that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice." 42 USC 1973(b). Thornburg v Gingles, 478 US 30, 43-46; 106 S Ct 2752; 92 L Ed 25 (1986) teaches that one makes this determination through an examination of the "totality of circumstances".

We are persuaded, however, that the masters did consider the totality of circumstances and that they were appropriately concerned with recognition of VRA interests. To that end, in adopting today's reapportionment plan, we have accepted for the most part the masters' plan while reconfiguring House Districts 4, 5, 11, 13 and 14 in order to provide a better racial balance throughout these districts.²

With the modifications noted in the according processor.

With the modifications noted in the preceding paragraph, we adopt the reapportionment plan drawn by the masters. It is hereby ordered and the Secretary of State is directed to publish as provided by law and hold legislative elections in accordance with the reapportionment plan hereby approved.

This Court retains no further jurisdiction.

Subsequently, a lawsuit was filed in Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, arguing that the apportionment and districting plan for the Michigan Senate and House of Representatives adopted by the Supreme Court in its April 1 order violated the federal Voting Rights Act. On June 15, 1992, the Michigan Supreme Court issued a 48-page unanimous memorandum violated the rederal voting regims Act. On June 19, 1992, the micringan supreme Court issued a 40-page infantintous inelhorandum opinion "to communicate the basis our decision fin the apportionment casel and, in the spirit of comity, to assist the federal court in the suit filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan." In re Apportionment of State Legislature—1992, 439 Mich 715 (1992). A three-member panel of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan ruled on July 14, 1994, that the legislative reapportionment plan adopted by the Michigan Supreme Court on April 1, 1992, was not racially discriminatory and did not have to be rewritten. NAACP v Secretary of State (Docket No. 92-CV-72696-DT).

²The following table reflects percentage of minority population in the plan proposed by the masters and that adopted by the Court in these House districts.

District	Masters' plan	Plan as adopted
. 4	. 89.89%	85.73%
5	65.41%	70.02%
11	95.80%	79.71%
13	57.10%	71.95%
14	67.04%	68.17%

¹The panel notes that one of its county breaks occurred due to the necessity of breaking Lenawee County, which has a population of 91,476, only 45 persons more than the maximum allowable for the county to have its own representative in the house. The panel suggests that the Court may consider finding this divergence de minimis, which would eliminate this county break. See Brown v Thompson, 462 US 835; 77 L Ed 2d 214; 103 S Ct 2690 (1983). The panel also notes that it can eliminate one additional county line break, but would then present some districts with bizarre configurations such as those described.